

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
**SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF IOWA**

**RECEIVED**

**DEC 30 2015**

**CLERK OF DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF IOWA**

Calvin Hammock  
5106 Brown Street  
Davenport, Iowa 52806

Plaintiff/ Petitioner  
Pro Se

**Case No. 3:15-cv-00111-JAJ-CFB**

**PLAINTIFF'S RESPONSE TO DEFENDANT**

**SPACE EXPLORATION TECHNOLOGIES**

**REPLY TO PLAINTIFFS RESISTANCE BRIEF**

**VS**

NASA HEADQUARTERS, DEPARTMENT  
OF DEFENSE, SPACE EXPLORATION  
TECHNOLOGIES SPACE X, APPLE,  
BLACKBERRY, CURVE CORP. VIRGIN  
MOBILE, MEDIACOM MCC IOWA LLC,  
AMERICAN WATER IOWA , ANY YET UN-  
IDENTIFIED ENTITIES , PERSONS,  
SATELLITES, GOVT AGENCIES, GOVT.  
TECHNOLOGIES, INTERAGENCIES, FUSION  
CENTER PARTICIPANT PARTNERS  
CORPORATIONS, COMPANIES, SOFTWARE USED  
BY AND WITH STATE ACTORS & TEMPORARY  
STATE ACTORS **DEFENDANTS**

---

**PLAINTIFF'S RESPONSE TO DEFENDANT  
SPACE EXPLORATION TECHNOLOGIES  
REPLY TO PLAINTIFFS RESISTANCE BRIEF**

---

NOW COMES Plaintiff in response to Space X reply to Plaintiffs resistance brief.

**ARGUMENT**

On December 3, 2015 Document 6 in this current case, District Court Judge ORDERED that because Plaintiff did not follow Local Rule plaintiffs filing was **'stricken'**.

Defendant SPACE EXPLORATION TECHNOLOGIES counsel is a legal professional and did not comply with local rule 5.2 at:

**1. Technical Failures**

**1. Jurisdictional Filing Deadline.** Some deadlines in the Federal Rules of Civil, Criminal , and Appellate Procedure are jurisdictional and cannot be extended. (*See, e.g.*, Fed. R. Civ. P 6 (b)(2).) It is the filer's

responsibility to ensure, by whatever means necessary, that a document is filed timely to comply with jurisdictional deadlines. A technical failure, including a failure of the ECF system, will not excuse the filer from compliance with a jurisdictional deadline.

The effect of not complying with deadlines that are reinforced by local jurisdictional rules as stated in Fed. R. Civ. Pro. 8 (6) are:

*EFFECT OF FAILING TO DENY “An allegation other than one relating to the amount of damages is admitted if a responsive pleading is required and the allegation is not denied. If a responsive pleading is not required, an allegation is considered denied or avoided.”*

Plaintiff did not respond to SPACE EXPLORATIONS argument in its Motion to Dismiss as it was time barred. Space Explorations counsel is a legal professional and cannot circumvent the rules of the court, particularly to issues of jurisdictional deadlines which cannot be extended. Defendant Space Exploration’s Counsel claims to have been befuddled as to try and circumvent the Plaintiffs MOTION FOR DEFAULT against SPACE EXPLORATION TECHNOLOGIES. To hold Plaintiff who is not a legal professional to a higher standard than professional counsel would be

unethical, unprofessional and would violate local jurisdictional rules as well as the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

### CONCLUSION

WHEREFORE Plaintiff so moves this court to **STRIKE** defendants SPACE EXPLORATION TECHNOLOGIES Motion to Dismiss and SPACE EXPLORATION TECHNOLOGIES Reply to Plaintiffs RESISTANCE To Space Exploration Technologies Motion to Dismiss.

December 29, 2015

Calvin Hammock

### CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that I am placing in the U.S. Mail by certified mail a copy of this response to ALL defendants and or Attorneys on December 29, 2015.

Calvin Hammock

Subscribed and sworn on December 29, 2015

Notary

Amy M. Emery

